



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/244,043	02/04/1999	HIRONORI KANNO	826.1535/JDH	3301

21171 7590 06/05/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
700 11TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

FEILD, JOSEPH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	19

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/244,043	KANNO ET AL.
	Examiner JOSEPH H FEILD	Art Unit 2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 3-14, 16 and 17 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 3-14, 16-17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . 6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to Amendment C, filed 3/17/03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 3-14, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretschneider et al (6,008,807).

With respect to independent claim 17, and dependent claims 3-5 and 10-11, Bretschneider discloses a "slide show presentation system"—refer to Bretschneider's

abstract. Bretschneider describes Microsoft Corporation's "PowerPoint" application.

Bretschneider further discloses:

"browser unit to obtain web page information using address information defined on an information network, and to output the obtained information" and "storage unit to store a predetermined correspondence relationship between a plurality of pieces of address information of web page information and a plurality of sequence numbers representing a predetermined output sequence" at abstract (*browser mode*), figure 1, column 3 (line 65) through column 4 (line 23), and column 6 (lines 44-58).

Bretschneider discloses the computer used to execute the slide presentation program (columns 3-4). Bretschneider discloses a *permanent storage medium 108* for storing the program and slide data. Refer also to Bretschneider's column 6 (lines 44-58), in which he discloses retrieving slide presentations from the Internet (hence, "web page information . . . defined on an information network").

"control unit to increment a control variable indicating one of the sequence numbers . . . ". Refer to Bretschneider's figures 9A-9C and column 10 (bottom) through column 13. (Note: there is a typographical error at the bottom of column 10—"6A-6C" should read "9A-9C".) Specifically, refer to Bretschneider's column 11 (lines 28-33), in which he discloses *allow a slide presentation author to select slides that are to be included in the slide show*. Bretschneider allows the user to customize the slide show to include selected slides.

It is noted that Bretschneider fails to explicitly teach the "user-specified correspondence relationship between . . . address information and . . . sequence

numbers". However, such a teaching would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of Bretschneider's teaching of the custom presentation (figure 9A (922), column 11) because the user can choose which slides and in what sequence. Thus, there is an implied correspondence between the address of the slide and the "sequence number". In other words, the order of presentation of the slides implies the claimed "sequence numbers".

With respect to dependent claims 6-7, refer to Bretschneider's column 11 (lines 33-41). Bretschneider teaches optionally using preset timings to automatically advance slides in the slide show. As per claim 7, it is noted that Bretschneider does not explicitly teach "changes the time intervals according to each of the plurality of sequence numbers". Bretschneider does teach "*Using timings*". It is noted that this term is plural, i.e., timings—not timing. Thus, it appears that Bretschneider teaches separate time intervals for individual slides. However, even if this were not the case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide variable time intervals because it was well known at the time of the invention that some slides could be skimmed over quickly, while others would warrant more time.

With respect to dependent claims 8-9, refer to Bretschneider's column 11 (lines 11-27), in which he discloses narrations. It is noted that Bretschneider fails to teach "music". However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include "music" because "narrations" broadly reads on any audio

annotation, including music or other sound effects. Since Bretschneider allows for narrations, then a sound card is implied, which indicates that other forms of audio annotation would be possible (and desirable, depending on what the user would want to include in the presentation).

With respect to dependent claim 16, Bretschneider's disclosure of automatic advancement via predetermined time intervals provides a teaching of "does not require manual advancement"—column 11, lines 33 et seq.

With respect to independent claims 12-14, refer to the rationale relied upon in rejecting independent claim 17. Claims 12 and 13 are essentially directed to "computer-readable storage medium which stores a program for causing a computer to perform" steps corresponding to the functions set forth in claim 17. Claim 14 is a "slide show method" for preparing and presenting a slide show that essentially corresponds with the functions set forth in claim 17.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 3/17/03 have been carefully considered, but are non-persuasive.

Applicant argues that (page 5, first full paragraph) "Bretschneider does not disclose or suggest a configuration for registering, in advance, a plurality of URL addresses specifying web pages together with presentation order specifying numbers in

an associated manner and presenting these specified web pages in a predetermined order". The examiner disagrees. At Bretschneider's column 9 (lines 64 et seq), he discloses, *a user viewing a kiosk browser mode slide show is limited to the predetermined sequences that are enabled by the hyperlink buttons. A hyperlink button may designate its corresponding target slide to be a slide in a presentation other than the presentation containing the hyperlink button. A hyperlink's address information may specify that the target slide exists on a remote computer, such as a World Wide Web (WWW) server.* Bretschneider's explicit teaching of a predetermined sequence implies the direct correlation between a sequence number and an address. There must be a first slide, a second slide, a third slide, etc. If the sequence is "predetermined", as is explicitly taught by Bretschneider, then the system "knows" which slide is first, second, third, etc. The author of the slide show, as taught by Bretschneider (see figure 9A and column 11), can pick, in advance, which slides to include. Suppose, for example, the user selects slides 1, 5, and 8 out of a group of slides to compose a custom slide show. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply a "control variable" as claimed because anyone having a basic understanding of programming principles would recognize that a well known and convenient way to step through a sequence (in this case to sequentially present slides in a slide show) would be to apply a programming loop, where the "control variable" would be an integer (N=1, 2, 3) corresponding to addresses of slides.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSEPH H FEILD whose telephone number is (703) 305-9792. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, HEATHER HERNDON, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are:

(703) 746-72398 **(After Final Communication)**

(703) 746-7239 (Official Communication)

(703) 746-7240 (Status Inquiries, Draft Communication).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Joseph H. Feild
Joseph H. Feild
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2176
May 31, 2003